

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1993

Development of writing for Spanish dominant limited English students in various models of primary education

Carol Wallin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wallin, Carol, "Development of writing for Spanish dominant limited English students in various models of primary education" (1993). *Theses Digitization Project*. 631.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/631>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

DEVELOPMENT OF WRITING FOR SPANISH DOMINANT
LIMITED ENGLISH STUDENTS IN VARIOUS MODELS
OF PRIMARY EDUCATION

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino


In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Education: Bilingual/Cross-Cultural

by
Carol Wallin
December 1993

DEVELOPMENT OF WRITING FOR SPANISH DOMINANT
LIMITED ENGLISH STUDENTS IN VARIOUS MODELS
OF PRIMARY EDUCATION

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Carol Wallin
December 1993
Approved by:


Jose Hernandez, PhD., First Reader

12/6/93
Date


Esteban Diaz. PhD., Second Reader

Abstract

The purpose of this project was to compare writing samples of students in three distinct learning contexts; those being instructed in their primary language, English, and dual language classrooms. The project was undertaken as a descriptive study. Nine students, three from each of the learning contexts were involved. Student writing samples were collected over a period of one school year and were taken from various writing tasks students were asked to complete.

Story summaries, journal writing, and letters to family members were evaluated and findings reported. Students in the dual language context showed gains in their use of English vocabulary in story summaries, although these gains were marked by periods of plateaus and regressions. Writing mechanics evaluated indicate that student in Spanish or dual language settings acquired skills of punctuation and capitalization at a higher rate than those in the English setting. Journal writing and the incorporation of acquired English vocabulary were found to be used at a higher percent by the students in the English instructed context

Acknowledgements

To the professors at California State University, especially Jose Hernandez, Esteban Diaz. Lynne Diaz-Rico, and Kathy Weed, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation for the hours reading and making suggestions on this project.

I would also like to express my love and thanks to my children, Nicole and Matthew, for making the sacrifice of having only a part time mom during the past two years while I completed the project and took classes for my M.A. degree. I would also like to thank my parents, Howard and Dorothy, and my brother, Ron, for all the hours they spent filling in my "mom" shoes, cooking and caring for the kids in my absence. Thanks to all of my family and friends for tolerating my eccentricities and moods during this process.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
Hierarchy Approaches to Writing.....	1
Whole Language Approaches to Writing.....	2
Writing and LEP Students.....	3
Writing and Language of Instruction.....	4
Purpose.....	9
Statement of the Problem.....	9
Research Questions.....	10
Theoretical Framework.....	10
Review of Related Literature.....	13
Quality of LEP Student's Writing.....	16
Written Mechanics of LEP Students.....	19
Journal Writing and LEP Students.....	20
Language Instruction Contexts.....	23
Summary of Literature Review.....	25
Design and Methodology.....	28
Subjects.....	28
Data Needed.....	29
Methodology.....	30
Instrumentation.....	31
Data Collection.....	32

Analysis and Results.....	34
Analysis Procedures.....	34
Analysis.....	36
Results.....	43
Discussion.....	45
Conclusions.....	47
Educational Implications.....	49
Appendix 1: Evaluation Form.....	51
Appendix 2: Writing Matrix.....	52
Appendix 3: Evaluation Form Designed.....	53
Appendix 4: Journal Assessment Form.....	54
References.....	55

List of Tables

Table 1.....	37
Table 2.....	38
Table 3.....	41

Chapter 1

Introduction

It is educationally important to understand the writing development of students who are beginning to write in their first or second language. This is particularly true for students who have some basic communication skills in English and are considered to be Limited English Proficient (LEP). The assumption has been that oral mastery in the second language must be achieved before students can begin to read or write in that language. However, current research demonstrates that writing skills are acquired parallel to oral skills (Dolly, 1990; Goldman & Rueda, 1988; Abramson, Seda, & Johnson, 1990). Both speaking and writing are interactive forms of communication, each requires a message sender and message receiver.

Hierarchy Approaches to Writing

Examining the instructional methods that appear to be most effective in developing good literacy skills in written work indicates that the hierarchy of language development is outdated (Goldman & Rueda, 1988; Diaz, 1986). This hierarchy perceives language as developing in a linear progression and assumes that a student must first be able to listen and understand prior to being able to speak, that speech must precede reading, and writing the final stage in language

learning. Traditionally, the approach to teaching writing has focused on drills and exercises involving the use of proper grammar and sentence structures. This rote linear teaching approach seldom engaged students in the writing process and resulted with limited written work. This notion is in contradiction with the results of whole language teaching methods in which all aspects of language learning is interactive. A holistic approach to learning benefits LEP students in that they are acquiring their second language through a more natural approach to communication.

Whole Language Approaches to Writing

How students begin to structure their thoughts on paper, choose vocabulary, and acquire the mechanics of writing i.e. spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc. is important to all teachers. Another trend in education supports the Natural Approach to ESL learning for LEP students and involves whole language in literacy (Williams & Snipper, 1990). For LEP students, the communicative model used in whole language focuses on actual exchanges and interactions with others. According to Abramson, Seda, and Johnson (1990) students learning a second language do best when they learn language by communicating, when all aspects of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are interrelated and developed concurrently. Focus is placed more on meaning than correctness. When all aspects of language become intertwined, mastery in one aspect is not required before learning can

occur in another. The Natural Approach to ESL incorporates aspects of whole language and departs from the sentence structuring and drill worksheets found in traditional writing instruction. Educators can assist students in their writing by providing experiences that enhance vocabulary development and illustrate proper use of mechanics in a meaningful way.

Writing and LEP Students

Even children who speak no English read English print in their environment and at an early stage in development can write English for various purposes. Hudelson (1984) reports these findings based on second language learners developing reading and writing skills in English. Earlier teaching methods for LEP students focused on the correction of error in written work and required oral mastery, delaying the students reading and writing development. Another extremely important finding reported was that the processes of reading, writing, speaking, and listening are interrelated and interdependent for second language learners. These findings support that teachers working with LEP students should utilize what the child expresses in their writing and give less attention to proper use of form.

Of particular interest to Ammon & Ammon (1987) was how LEP students were learning English as a Second Language (ESL) at the same time they were learning to read and write, especially writing in English. Based on case studies, their results point toward a "holistic" approach in learning ESL.

Evaluations of student's writing should be based on individual strengths and needs to be viewed over a period of time to determine progress.

Writing and Language of Instruction

Instruction in writing in elementary school programs has been investigated by researchers, yet it is important to understand the complexities and additional issues involved in teaching writing in classrooms where different languages of instruction are utilized. Student writing in various language instructional contexts has been examined by Edelsky and Jilbert (1985); Campbell, Gray, Rhodes, and Snow (1985); and Ammon (1987). These investigations point to the need to further examine the teaching of writing in bilingual education.

Recent research indicates that writing skills are acquired over time; the more opportunities for students to write, the more likely their writing skills will improve (Peyton, Staton, Richardson, & Wolfram, 1990). Writing by students is marked with growth spurts, plateaus, and regressions which vary from student to student (Ammon, 1987). Although writing does not develop in a direct parallel to oral language, it is a part of language development and does not require oral mastery to have meaning (Edelsky & Jilbert, 1985). Children begin to scribble and convey messages through print before they achieve oral mastery in a language. Writing

does require higher cognitive abilities than the spoken word; students must disengage themselves from the sensory aspects of oral communication and develop abstract qualities in communication (Vygotsky, 1989). Speaking and reading share many commonalities, but writing is far more difficult, especially for students learning a second language. The language a student is being instructed in and the amount of time they are exposed to their second language in an ESL setting will influence the student's use of their second language as well as their growth and understanding of the content being presented.

By utilizing active communication and participation between teachers and students, the issues of the development of writing and oral language learning can be addressed. Examining which vocabulary students incorporate into their writing and which mechanical skills, such as capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, as well as student abilities to summarize content and relate main ideas, may clue educators as to which instructional methods are most effective for teaching these particular skills.

Interaction between students and teachers was clearly evident in many studies yet, there was no indication that writing skills were being taught in isolation (Abramson, Seda, & Johnson, 1990, Ammon, 1987, Diaz, 1986, Hadaway, 1992). The process of drafting, revising, editing, encouraged the skills to develop in the writers. In English instructed contexts, whole language activities that required the

construction of meaning seemed to be most helpful for students acquiring a second language. Listening, speaking, reading and writing together holistically assisted LEP students acquiring English. Teaching in thematic units was successful when students were acquiring vocabulary and knowledge on given topics (Franklin, 1988, Hudelson, 1984). Using reciprocal discourse, students could negotiate meanings as a direct outcome of their interaction and meanings were constructed by reacting to materials presented, questioning, or seeking clarifications. Many of the studies focused on "holistic" communicative competencies, and the influences of the student's background and culture were considered (Bartolome, Bastian, & Kuhlman, 1991, Brown & Bailey, 1984). Skills required in writing were acquired as a result of interacting with others and print in the environment. Proper use of capitalization, punctuation and expanded vocabulary by LEP students can be acquired by being exposed to interactions with reading and writing activities.

Literacy is both an active and functional process, and needs to be taught as such. Students who are literate in their primary language have the background knowledge to transfer to their second language learning. Writing in interactive journals and responding to stories helps facilitate LEP students acquisition of language. Students who sense a continuity between their personal experiences and the classroom often do better in acquiring a second language (Dolly, 1990). Because there is more opportunity for

interaction with the teacher and peers, students seem to learn more (Abramson, Seda, & Johnson, 1990).

Writing is being fostered as early as kindergarten and often pre-writing experiences have begun at home prior to the student entering school (Perez, Torres-Guzman, 1992). By kindergarten, students are developing skills writing before they learn to read. Many students will display "scribble writings" which indicate students do make a connection between the spoken and written forms of communication. Later, psuedo letters may appear. These are the learners' first attempts to copy letters they see in print. This is followed by the actual writing of letters, the formation of psuedo-words, copying words or phrases, writing self-generated words, and finally the writing of self-generated words and texts (Peregoy & Boyle, 1989-90). The research of Peregoy and Boyle indicate there was no actual teaching of skills such as capitalization and punctuation, however, over time the students developed these skills and began incorporating these practices into their writing. This same process and progression in writing occurs with all children, regardless of which type of instructional language context they are in. It is a developing process where students sort out and use information they have acquired.

Students as young as kindergarten can be given examples of how writing is functional in daily use by making lists, writing about stories they have heard, and writing notes to themselves and others. Interactive journals also played an

important role in writing. In the beginning, students may only draw pictures to illustrate concepts learned while others write words using invented spellings. More advanced students may even write whole sentences. Varying stages of student's individual development can range from very low level skills to higher levels of cognition.

Students learning in different language teaching contexts has been researched by Edelsky & Jilbert (1985), Cronnell (1985), Campbell (1985), Laing (1988), and Bartolome (1991). Results of these studies indicate that LEP students errors in writing are not random, but occur as the child makes hypothesis about their second language. Edelsky and Jilbert (1985) provide insights which supports that students learn to acquire two separate language systems and these are applied to their writing. Writing in their primary language provides basic skills that can be transferred to writing in a second language. Students learning to write in English did not use tildes on English words, whereas they did on Spanish words. Due to interactive experiences, students could learn and were inspired by others in their own writing. Development of writing didn't appear to differ in form or content whether students primary language was English or Spanish according to Bartolome (1991). Laing (1988) examined the writing of English speaking students who were immersed in French speaking schools and compared their writing to that of their English instructed peers.

Studies such as Laing's have prompted and directed this

current project to review how instruction being delivered in different language contexts influences the written performance of LEP students.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to compare the writing development of LEP students in three distinct language teaching contexts; primary language use, English immersion, and dual language instruction. Of particular interest is how students in the different instructional contexts would respond to the same tasks, especially on story summaries, writing mechanics and vocabulary use. Finding which methods of instruction may be most beneficial to LEP students as they learn to write may be influenced by the type of classroom setting and language(s) of instruction.

Statement of the Problem

The problem being examined is in describing the writing development of LEP students in classes that use: primary language, English immersion, or dual language. The aim of this project is to determine how student's writing progresses may differ on story summaries, mechanics, and vocabulary use across three separate language teaching environments.

Research Questions

In order to assess if differences in language teaching contexts are related to differences in student writing development, the following research questions guide this project:

1. Will having dual language (bilingual) instruction increase the quality of story summaries in the students second language?
2. Will there be differences in students' writing mechanics related to the three language instruction contexts?
3. Will there be differences in the use of acquired English vocabulary in journal writing for students in the three different instructional contexts?

Theoretical Framework

This project was influenced by a combination of theoretical approaches which view interaction as being a factor in both learning and teaching. Primarily the developing cognition of the child guides them in their development of writing. Initially writing has a functional association with gestures. Later student drawings and writings are related, and still later writing is viewed by students as communication. Children begin to understand the

sound representations and acquire spelling skills as they grow and develop. Writing is a part of language acquisition should not prevent the introduction and use of meaningful writing experiences (Goldman & Rueda, 1988). Cronnell (1985) reports that students oral language influences their written texts. Underlying this notion is the idea that the language of instruction will influence students writing to the extent that students interact with peers and the teacher to develop writing parallel to the oral language skills they are developing. Thus, the relationship between oral and written language appears to be interactional and influenced by the language of instruction. Teachers and students mediate events to assist in understanding concepts and understanding aids students in their writing tasks (Abramson, 1990).

The second theory influencing this project has its roots in the sociohistorical perspective of Vygotsky (1989). The interaction between student and teacher, student and student, and student with activities provides the mechanism that allows learning to occur. Writing cannot be viewed as an isolated skill, it is integrated through listening, speaking, and reading in interactive discourse. Writing for young students in elementary programs reflects an interplay between developing cognitive processes and interactive learning where meaning is constructed by participants. Therefore, the language of instruction being used to present the materials will relate to the student's writing because the interaction occurring in the classroom setting is influenced by that

language. These two theories provide the basis for viewing the student's progress and development of writing in different language teaching contexts.

Another important theory related to which language(s) students are instructed in has been addressed by Cummins (1989). Cummins discusses the additive bilingual principle, reporting that bilingual students possess a greater awareness of linguistic meanings and have more than one language system which they are able to draw information from. The theory of additive bilingualism should indicate that some differences may be found in student work as a direct or indirect result of the language(s) of instruction being used in class.

Another of Cummins' ideas is of the common underlying proficiency (CUP) which describes how language systems acquired separately are related to each other. Students who are instructed in both their primary language and English as a second language will acquire the two language systems and be better prepared linguistically to write.

The combination of the three theories described provide a pathway for reviewing student vocabulary, mechanics, and use of their acquired second language. The findings can then be addressed within the language teaching contexts that the children experience.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Over the past ten years researchers have attempted to find answers to questions relating to language acquisition by second language learners. Studies have been conducted to determine if dual language (bilingual) programs assist students to acquire more second language skills than students taught in either English or primary language settings (Edelsky & Jilbert, 1985; Campbell, Gray, Rhodes, & Snow, 1985). The purpose of these studies was to examine if the language of instruction was related to second language learning.

Writing in elementary education programs has also been a focal point of various studies (Cronnell, 1985; Hudelson, 1984; Laing, 1988; Bartolome, 1991). The purpose of these studies was to examine students writing progress in relation to the language of instruction. The focus of these studies was to examine the quality of writing, the use of proper mechanics, and writing in journals. Combining these research areas gives rise to questions regarding how LEP students instructed in various linguistical settings influence their writing progress in the elementary grades. Will having bilingual instruction increase the quality of English story summaries? Is there a relationship between development of writing mechanics and different language instruction contexts? Do students in a primary language, English

immersion or bilingual class show differences in their use of English vocabulary in daily journal writings?

The combined theories of cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1989) and interactive approaches to learning (Cronnell, 1985; Goldman & Rueda, 1988) are related to issues in bilingual education and writing. Early studies of second language acquisition imply a deviation from traditional approaches in writing instruction occurred by incorporating whole language teaching approaches. Rather than focusing on grammar and drills, focus was shifted to interactive communication in writing. Teaching in different language contexts was becoming a new research area, with literacy as its goal. Studies by Laing (1988), Campbell, Gray, Rhodes and Snow (1985), Edelsky and Jilbert (1985), Ammon (1987), and others searched for answers to questions regarding children's acquisition of second language literacy.

Hudelson (1984) reports some general findings on the writing of second language learners. One of these findings was that children who speak little or no English are reading print in English in their environment which increases their use of English. LEP students are able to read English print before they have completely mastered the language orally. This finding supports the concept that reading and writing are closely related processes. This indicates that LEP students can and should write English before they have complete control over the oral language and formal writing systems.

More recent studies have also set out to understand what influence the language of instruction, methods of teaching language skills, and socio-cultural aspects have on LEP student's achievement in elementary schools. Peyton, Staton, Richardson, & Wolfram (1990) compared writing tasks and the effects on student writing. Students were given three assigned writing tasks and one unassigned task. The three assigned tasks included writing an essay, writing a letter of thanks, and writing a letter to a friend. The unassigned writing task was writing in journals. The results of the study demonstrated that students tend to write more when the writing is tied to their own personal experiences. Writing in journals resulted with three times the amount of written text found in the three teacher assigned tasks. Students appeared to be more willing to take risks with their use of English in journal writing. Other researchers such as Medina (1991) and Abramson, Seda, & Johnson (1990) share insights on how oral and written language skills are best acquired when interaction plays a key role in instruction. Dolly (1990), Bartolome (1991), and Hadaway (1992) also look at journal writings by LEP students in elementary classrooms. The purpose of these studies was to examine if children from diverse linguistic backgrounds would develop skills in writing in the same manner and sequence as monolingual English speaking students.

In the past, the assumption has been that students need to have oral mastery of their second language prior to

writing or reading in that language. This chapter will review studies from the mid-eighties to the present that relate to the issues of second language vocabulary usage, journal writings, proper use of mechanics, and languages of instruction within the classroom.

Quality of LEP Student's Writing

Alvarez (1983) analyzed oral interaction between first grade Mexican American students and teacher's aides in order to determine the percentages of standard and non-standard use of dialect, codeswitching, and language interference. Most of the errors detected were related to vowel changes, the devoicing of final consonants, cluster reductions, and stress changes. Although the Alvarez study does not directly focus on writing, Edelsky (1986) reports similar errors are encountered in student writing in their second language. The oral errors relate to the written errors, for example a devoicing of the final consonant in a word like "girl" may become "gir" to second language learners when writing. The overall quality of students writing is strongly influenced by their oral command of language because the two systems interplay.

In research conducted by Cronnell (1985), the oral language level of a student was determined to be a predictor of the written texts produced by third and sixth grade LEP students. This study focused on written errors made by

students rather than on their correct use of language. The errors noted were related to or associated with Spanish spelling, dropping consonants in clusters, and changes in vowel sounds. Cronnell's study also supports the findings Alvarez (1983) reported relating to the error patterns of students learning a second language. The oral errors made by LEP students seem directly related to their written errors.

Hudelson (1984) has reported extensively on issues concerning the reading and writing development of children acquiring a second language. Some of the findings confirm that LEP students are exposed to English print in daily living experiences. Children read signs and learn from their environment before they are completely in control of their second language orally. The relationship between reading and writing is so strong that often children may write in English and read their own text before formal reading instruction begins. This relationship between reading and writing provides evidence that children can and should be encouraged to write before they have gained oral mastery in their second language.

Children create meaning using language when they respond to stories. They begin to identify with the characters, the actions, and the conflicts or plots. Franklin (1988) reviewed the stories written by kindergarten and first graders. The student's work reflected that students were learning more about the functions and processes of writing in various contexts. Some students wrote in response to the action,

others in story summaries, and still others wrote in response to the story's conclusion. Ammon and Ammon (1987) also studied individual LEP children's writing samples and report that students written responses to stories exhibit periods of growth spurts, plateaus, and regressions in their quality. Children responded to stories differently and used various strategies. These authors state the need for further research on individual children's written performances to observe how progress occurs over time and in response to experiences.

As traditional approaches to teaching writing have been replaced with whole language approaches, researchers are looking for answers to how second language learners respond to writing in English. Abramson, Seda, and Johnson (1990) discussed the benefits of methods which integrate language, reading, and writing. Children learn language best when it is meaningful and interesting to them. Writing was focused on meaning rather than form. LEP students participating in whole language activities acquire both oral and written skills using stories as a base for communicating with a meaningful purpose.

Hadaway (1992) presented evidence that students should be encouraged to write in their second language. This study reports two common practices which hinder student writing; one is having a teacher who assumes children who do not speak English should have writing deferred. The second practice occurs when focus is placed on grammar, error correction, and limited written work, as with a fill in the blank type

activity. LEP students interacting socially and linguistically for real content develop the facility for written language while developing their oral competence. Dolly (1990) discussed the value of this interaction by using reciprocal discourse to assist students in creating meaning.

A study by Medina (1991) examined the results of a maintenance bilingual education program in grades one through eight. This was done to illustrate the benefits of having strong native language skills as a firm foundation for transfer of those skills into the second language. The results of this study lend to the development of writing as an indirect outcome of improved reading skills. This may indicate for the current project that those students in either primary language instruction or a bilingual setting may develop vocabularies and quality in writing better than their English-only instructed peers.

Written Mechanics of LEP Students

Specific problems of proper grammar and syntax use are unique to second language learners and have been identified by Diaz (1986) who reports that the older, traditional methods of writing instruction are not effective. The traditional focus on grammar, syntax, and error correction has been changed to strategies which involve peer work and group involvement. The process of writing; from the draft, to the revisions prior to the final product, is a method of

writing instruction aimed at assisting students learning the proper mechanics of writing. Errors are expected and accepted. The process of proofreading and editing with others lowers the anxiety of students when asked to complete a writing assignment.

A year long study of first, second, and third graders by Edelsky and Jilbert (1985) focused on aspects of spelling, codeswitching, segmentation, punctuation, quality of content, and use of structures. This study supports the theory that children in a bilingual setting acquire two separate language systems in their writing. One student in particular wrote first in his second language and later in his primary language. Errors that were found were not random but

rather the result of children hypothesizing about aspects of language. Children made generalizations of phonetic features and placed periods at the end of every line. These results provide insight into the thinking processes students are using when completing a writing task.

Journal Writing and LEP Students

To study the effects of various writing tasks on student products, Peyton, Staton, Richardson, and Wolfram (1990) analyzed the writings of twelve sixth grade students in the Los Angeles area. Of an original sample of twenty six students, six boys and six girls were selected. Six students were Asian and six were Hispanic. Four of the twelve had been

classified as highly proficient in English, four were considered to be functioning at mid-range, and four were low English proficient, based on the Survey of Essential Skills.

Students in this study were assigned various writing tasks. Three tasks were teacher assigned and the fourth was journal writing with student selected topics. Daily journal writing was continued throughout the year and samples were of all tasks were collected in the spring. The three teacher assigned tasks included writing essays comparing and contrasting grasslands and deserts, writing a letter to a friend, and writing a letter of thanks to another teacher. The findings of this study indicate more complex writing was evident in the letter to a friend while journal writings contained three times the amount of writing in comparison to the teacher assigned work. Students used more language connectors in their in their journal writing, words such as: and, because, but, if, and why. The possibility of the difference in the quantity of journal writing may have been influenced by the fact that students were writing in their journals everyday throughout the year and completed their teacher assigned writings during one week toward the end of the year. Regardless, the difference in the quantity of writing remained between the types of tasks students were asked to complete.

The daily journals and letter to a friend were written for a familiar audience and related to personal experiences. When the task was assigned and less closely tied to personal

experience it was not as communicative. Implications of this study point out that a single sample of text does not give a complete picture of the student's range of ability and that self-selected topics play a significant role in writing results. LEP students must be exposed to a variety of contexts and given opportunities to explore writing under various circumstances and with various purposes.

Another study on journal writing (Bartolome, Bastian, and Kuhlman, 1991) examine the emerging writing of Spanish and English speaking students in a two way bilingual program. Results of this study demonstrate that students approach writing tasks in a variety of ways. Some students use drawings and squiggles to convey messages while others use letters, words, and even complete sentences. Interaction with others carries a student from their current level and ability to higher and more difficult levels as they watch and observe others, imitate, ask for advice, and offer suggestions to one another. This study demonstrated that children with diverse linguistic backgrounds develop writing skills in the same manner and sequence as English speaking students. This may indicate that writing skills across language teaching contexts may be very similar and show no significant difference. The use of journals focuses on familiar contexts, a known audience, and familiar topics. This type of writing encourages students, whereas too much teacher control of the topic has been found to be discouraging.

Language Instruction Contexts

In a study conducted by Campbell, Gray, Rhodes, and Snow (1985), three oral language programs were compared. Two French, three Spanish, and an English program were examined. Students in these programs had studied French or Spanish for four to seven years and were placed in classrooms where instruction was delivered in French, Spanish, or English. Not only were there differences between the schools that participated, but between the programs themselves. Results of this study indicate that the more exposure students are given in their second language, the better they were able to evaluate their own primary language skills. English speaking students enrolled in the immersion program were instructed in Spanish or French beginning in kindergarten, and upon entering second grade, were instructed in English for language arts. Through the sixth grade, the amount of instructional time in English increased. These students showed the highest gains in their levels of oral second language proficiency.

In the partially immersed classes, instruction was delivered in Spanish or French for a minimum of seventy minutes per day and English for the remainder of the

day. These students were ranked as second in scoring gains. The students enrolled in the Foreign Language in Elementary Schools (FLES) program were instructed in English and received instruction in the foreign language (Spanish or

French) twenty to forty-five minutes daily. These students received the lowest ranking of gains.

Students enrolled in the bilingual (or immersion) classes were taught most of their subjects in their second language. Seventy-five percent of their instruction was delivered in the second language (French or Spanish). These students showed the highest gains in their oral acquisition of their second language. A total of 382 students from different schools were included in this study. This study provides insight as to how students in a primary language, immersion, or bilingual program may perform in their writing given their differing instructional contexts because of the strong relationship between oral and written language.

In Canada, Laing (1988) compared writing skills of English speaking eighth graders immersed in French speaking schools. Comparison groups of English instructed students were established with similar socio-economic backgrounds as those in the immersion program. Students were not randomly assigned, those in the immersion program had been placed by parental choice. Results of the study showed that in fourth grade, students in the English program spelled better, yet immersion students scored higher in originality. In the fifth grade immersion students scored significantly higher in using complete sentences and proper use of punctuation. By seventh grade, immersion students scored higher on overall quality and sentence complexity. Overall results indicated that students in immersion programs were as well, if not better,

prepared in writing as their English instructed peers. Results of Laing's study may indicate that majority students in the immersion program performed better in the quality of their writing in comparison to other majority students.

Summary of Literature Review

In order to apply the studies reviewed to the current project, three specific areas needed to be addressed. The first is related to the question regarding students in a dual language context using increasingly more English vocabulary when summarizing stories heard in class. Medina (1991) asserts that if a student has a firm foundation in their primary language, this will lend to a greater transfer of skills in their second language. This would seem to indicate that students being exposed to both languages should be better able to use the knowledge they have in their primary language and thus make better use of their acquired vocabulary in their second language. Franklin (1988) and Ammon (1987) discuss the benefits of using stories as a base for writing with LEP students as this will assist them in creating meaning in their second language and offer opportunities to explore the many variations of discovering how to interpret information, identify with characters, and respond to actions. Children are able to listen to a story, write a written response, and then read their response before having formal instruction in reading. Individual strengths

are easily identified in story writing tasks. Edelsky and Jilbert (1985) report that children in a bilingual setting are building two language systems which they can use to draw information from. Campbell's results (1985) also indicate that students in dual language instruction programs make greater advances in writing due to being exposed to two languages. The findings by these researchers indicate that those students enrolled in a dual language context may make marked gains in their use of English in story summaries.

Research reviewed addressed the question regarding mechanics. Would students from any one of the three language instruction groups show a marked difference in their use of proper mechanics, such as capitalization and punctuation? Alvarez (1983) and Edelsky (1986) point to errors being a product of students attempts to make generalizations and hypotheses about what writing should look like. The research stated that student errors are not random, but part of the student's individual processing and rationalizing about language. Spelling errors can be attributed to the non-standard pronunciation and interference from the student's primary language (Cronnell, 1985). Insight as to whether there will be differences in the writing mechanics across language contexts was provided by Laing (1988), Edelsky and Jilbert (1985), and Campbell et al (1985) as well. Although all students demonstrated they were making progress, students in either an immersion or bilingual classroom seemed to use proper mechanics better than the students instructed in their

primary language. These results may indicate that the students enrolled in dual language or English immersion contexts may display a more standard use of writing mechanics than those students enrolled in a primary language context.

The third question raised is would any one group across the three language contexts use more of their acquired second language in their journal writings? Diaz (1986) addressed the issue that second language learning is facilitated when used in a natural and communicative sense. Writing on self-selected topics provides a familiar base and enables students to obtain information (Dolly, 1990). Peyton, Staton, Richardson, & Wolfram (1990) were able to demonstrate that students wrote three times the amount when writing in journals compared to other writing tasks. Laing's study (1988) provided insight into how English speaking students immersed in French speaking schools did as well as their English instructed counterparts on writing tasks, and over time even surpassed their peers on complexity ratings. Edelsky and Jilbert (1985) also concluded that writing occurs and develops more through contexts related to student experiences. When students select their own topics, there is a significant increase in the quality of written work.

Chapter 3

Design and Methodology

This descriptive study compares the writing of a selected sample of second grade students in dual language, primary language, and English-only instructed classrooms. A case study approach will be used to compare the second language writing development of three students in each of the three types of classroom settings. Comparisons will be based on the analysis of writing quality, mechanics, and the use of acquired English vocabulary. Student writing samples used to assess their development were collected over a seven month period (October - April).

Subjects

Nine second graders, three from each language context setting, were selected. All nine students had entered school in kindergarten and received instruction in English accompanied by extensive ESL for two years. Student's second language proficiency was tested using the IDEA Language Proficiency Test (Ballard & Tighe, 1980 & 1989) and assessed as limited English proficient (LEP). Students were selected with comparable family, socio-economic, and educational backgrounds. Seven of the students were girls and two were boys. All students came from environments where Spanish is the predominant language and parents work in semi-skilled or

unskilled labor. All are eligible for, and are receiving, free lunch.

In the primary language setting, Spanish is used for instruction in reading, writing, math, science, and social studies. English as a second language (ESL) is provided by the classroom teacher for a thirty minute period daily, and music and physical education are provided in English only three times a week. In the English only classroom, ESL and sheltered English approaches are used to provide daily instruction to students. In the dual language room, students are instructed in both English and Spanish with the ratio of Spanish to English language use varying from 30:70% to 50:50%. Teachers in all three classrooms incorporate the whole language approach and encourage interaction within the class by promoting peer and group work activities. In all three contexts, writing is not taught as a separate function in the language arts program.

Data Needed

Three different writing tasks were given to the students to assess their writing quality, mechanics, and vocabulary use. During November, January, and March students were asked to write a summary of a story that had been read to them. Throughout the year, students in all three learning contexts were asked to write in their daily journals, so that samples of acquired English vocabulary could be obtained. Finally,

during the month of April, all students were asked to write a letter to their parents inviting them to a school function. A total of seventy samples were collected and evaluated in order to assess the student's quality, mechanics, and vocabulary use in writing.

Methodology

In order to compare writing samples of student's individual progress as well as progress across learning contexts, equivalent tasks needed to be established. Students in all three instructional contexts were exposed to the same materials by selecting stories that were written in both Spanish and English. The three teachers read the stories in the language(s) used for instruction. Using the "Story Summary" form from Frank Schaeffer's Literature Your Way students were asked to write a summary of the story they heard. The stories read in the classrooms were Swimmy, Diego, and The Little Red Hen. Students were then asked to write a two or three sentence summary of each story and also draw an illustration. Daily journal writing was also required from all students in each classroom, this was used to compare use of English in journal writings across the instructional contexts. In the spring, all students were asked to write a letter to their parents inviting them to a special school function. Student samples were then collected, copied, and assigned codes for later identification.

Instrumentation

The scoring instrument devised for this project was based on Goodman's (1989) work which measures the writing mechanics and quality of text. This was combined with a district Writing Matrix which is used to evaluate fluency, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure (see appendices 1-3). This combined form writing matrix is used to evaluate student work on three levels: beginning (B), intermediate (I), and advanced (A). Using this newly devised writing matrix, teachers from unrelated schools scored the student samples to assist in determining gains, plateaus, or regressions for those students in the bilingual setting to demonstrate increased use of English vocabulary in story summaries. This matrix was used to evaluate use of proper mechanics in regard to use of punctuation, capitalization, and use of conventional spelling. Samples gathered for the evaluation of mechanics across the three contexts were story summaries and letters written to parents. Evaluators scored this work using the letters "B" for the beginning level, "I" for the intermediate level, or "A" indicating an advanced level in their writing skills (see appendix 2 for details of levels "B", "I", and "A").

Journal writings were assessed using the Interactive Writing Journal Assessment form from the Title VII Portfolio (see appendix 4). Teacher evaluators scored journal writings to determine if increased use of acquired English appeared in

print across the three learning contexts. Student work was evaluated on whether entries were written in their primary or second language, whether printed messages conveyed more meaning than pictures, if the student elaborated on thoughts or showed any personal reflection, and whether or not they used descriptive words in their writing. Students received a score of "E" if they showed evidence of the skill and "N" if it was not evident in their writing sample.

Data Collection

All students involved in this project were required to keep daily journals and had been assigned writing tasks for purposes of this study throughout the year. Students were asked to summarize stories teachers read aloud in class and asked to write a letter to their parents at the end of the year. This project spanned one school year. Tasks began in September and focused mainly on journal writing for the first two months. By November, students were asked to write story summaries. All nine students were exposed to the same stories. Students in primary instruction heard the story in Spanish. Students in English immersion heard them in English. Students in the bilingual setting heard the stories in both languages. Samples of story summaries were collected in November, January, and March. Journal samples were collected semi-monthly beginning in October. One letter written to each child's parent was collected in April. These samples were

then scored and tabulated for analysis.

Analysis and results will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Results

The purpose of this project was to examine the following questions:

- 1.) Will students receiving dual language instruction increase the quality of story summaries in their second language?
- 2.) Will there be differences in student's writing mechanics across the three language instruction groups?
- 3.) Will there be differences in the use of acquired English vocabulary in journal writing for students in the three different instructional contexts?

In order to answer these questions, the following analysis was performed.

Analysis Procedures

Each of the writing tasks was scored using a holistic scoring process. Two scorers were involved, and any discrepancies in scoring were settled by a third evaluator who reviewed the materials. Student papers were scored based on the evaluations of the two scorers in agreement. The forms used for this process were explained in chapter three. Information was then organized in table form. This format determined if students were making gains, staying at

plateaus, or encountering regressions in their writing efforts.

Analysis for each question was performed in the following manner:

Question 1 : Student samples of story summaries were gathered in November, January, and March. Analysis of the samples for the three students in the dual language context were assessed for quality i.e., fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and sentence variety. Students were assessed as being at beginning (B), intermediate (I), or advanced (A) levels along the four quality dimensions. The growth analysis provided information as to whether individual students gained, showed no movement or regressed in their second language quality of writing.

Question 2 : All nine students were asked to write a letter to their parents inviting them to a special school function at the end of the year and to write story summaries at four different times during the year. As in the previous analysis students were assessed as advanced (A), intermediate (I), beginning (B), or not evident (N) along the three subcategories for writing mechanics i.e. use of periods, use of capitals and use of invented spelling.

Question 3: Samples of all student writing was collected from their daily interactive journals for October, December, February, and April. Students were assessed on their second language writing in the areas of conceptual interpretation, meaning through print, elaboration of thoughts, personal

reflection and use of descriptive words. Analysis of student writing samples indicated whether evidence (E) or no evidence (N) of students having these concepts were present.

The first question posed for this project was if students in a bilingual setting would improve their writing quality. Three students' samples for this particular analysis were used. Comparisons were made for each particular child's writing development, looking for gains, plateaus, or regressions in their writing. The second question was if any group across the teaching contexts would show any differences in the use of proper mechanics. This was analyzed by comparing story summary samples and letters. To answer the third question, if any one group across the three contexts would use more of their acquired English in journal writings, samples of journal entries were used.

Analysis

Question 1

In order to answer the first question posed for this project, will having dual language instruction increase the quality of second language writing in story summaries, student samples were analyzed in comparison to their own individual progress over time. See Table 1. Based on the information collected, the following analysis was made.

In the samples collected in November, Jose was writing at

Table 1

Comparison of Story Summaries in Dual Language Teaching Context

	Jose			Blanca			Adrian		
Quality	N	J	M	N	J	M	N	J	M
1. Fluency	B	I	I	B	I	I	B	I	B
2. Grammar	B	I	I	B	I	I	B	I	I
3. Vocabulary	B	B	B	I	B	I	B	I	I
4. Sentence Variety	B	B	B	B	I	B	B	B	B

beginning level in all four areas of writing evaluated. By January, Jose shows a gain to the intermediate level in both fluency and grammar which remained his level on the March sample. His use of vocabulary and sentence structures remained at a plateau throughout the year.

Blanca wrote at the beginning level in areas of fluency, grammar, and sentence variety, yet demonstrated vocabulary use at an intermediate level. In January, her progress in vocabulary regressed to a beginning level but she improved in fluency, grammar, and sentence variety. By March she gained back her original score of intermediate level in vocabulary use, maintained her intermediate status in fluency and grammar, but regressed in sentence variety.

Adrian received scores at the beginning level in all four areas assessed in November. By January, his scores in fluency, grammar, and vocabulary were raised to an intermediate level but his score for sentence variety remained at the beginning level. During March, Adrian maintained his gains in both grammar and vocabulary use but regressed in fluency and showed no change in sentence

variety.

All of the students in the dual language context demonstrated gains in writing quality of story summaries. Two students gained in the area of fluency and all three showed gains in grammar. Some gain was evident in vocabulary use, while no gains were made in sentence variety.

Question 2

To answer the second question analysis of the writing mechanics of students across the three learning contexts was conducted. Story summaries along with student letters to their parents were scored for this purpose. See Table 2.

Table 2

Comparison of Mechanics Across Instructional Contexts

	Spanish	Dual Language	English
1. Uses periods	-	+	-
2. Uses capitals	+	o	-
3. Number of Invented spellings	o	o	o

- Regression

+ Gain

o Plateau

Students in the Spanish language context all began at an advanced (A) level in their use of periods in November and regressed to not showing evidence of using periods, and finally in April had returned to an intermediate (I) level. This demonstrates an overall regression as the scores never rose back to the advanced level.

In the dual language context, student samples collected in November ranged from not evident (N), beginning (B), and intermediate (I). By April the samples were raised to levels of intermediate and advanced, with students showing individual gains as well as group gains.

Scores for the English instructional context all began at an advanced level in November. However, by April all three students had regressed to an intermediate level. In demonstrating the correct use of periods, students in the dual language context were the only group to show gains while students in the Spanish and English instructed contexts showed evidence of regressions.

Examining the use of capitals, students in the Spanish context all scored at a beginning level in November and increased their scores to intermediate and advanced levels by April. This demonstrates a positive gain for the students in this learning context.

Students in the dual language context scored at advanced levels in November and continued to receive advanced scores through April, indicating they had reached a plateau. In contrast, students in the English context received advanced scores in November but had regressed to the intermediate level in April.

In the area of using capitals, students instructed in Spanish showed gains, while students in dual language reached a plateau and students in the English instructed context showed a regression.

Students from all three language contexts used inventive spelling in November samples. The number of invented spellings had decreased to zero for students in all contexts by April. This may have been the result of spelling instruction which occurred in all classrooms throughout the year and may be influenced by the students gaining understanding of conventional spellings through dictionary use. All nine students were using conventional spelling by April, showing a gain for students in all three language contexts.

Question 3

The third question for this project asks if students in any of the three contextual settings would incorporate more use of acquired English in their journal writings. Samples were collected from the nine students and scored using five of the concepts from the Interactive Writing Journal Assessment form described in chapter three. These concepts include: conceptual interpretation, meaning through print, elaboration of thoughts, reflection, and use of descriptive words. Student work received the score of "E" if they showed evidence of the particular concept, and a score of "N" if there was no evidence in the sample. If the student wrote in Spanish the sample was not used, only journal entries in English were analyzed. The scores on journal writings were tabulated to provide an overview of the student's abilities

to incorporate their acquired English. See Table 3.

Table 3

Comparison of Acquired English Vocabulary Across Language Contexts

Spanish Instruction	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr
Concepts	Janette				Karitina				Lupe			
1. Conceptual Interpretation	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
2. Meaning through print	E	N	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
3. Elaborates thoughts	E	N	N	N	N	E	N	E	N	N	N	N
4. Personal reflection	E	N	N	N	N	N	E	N	E	E	N	E
5. Uses descriptive words	E	N	N	N	N	N	E	E	N	E	N	E

Dual Language Instruction	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr
Concepts	Jose				Blanca				Adriar			
1. Conceptual Interpretation	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
2. Meaning through print	E	E	E	E	E	N	E	E	E	E	E	E
3. Elaborates thoughts	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	E	E	N	N
4. Personal Reflection	N	E	N	E	E	N	N	N	E	E	E	N
5. Uses Descriptive words	N	N	N	N	E	N	N	N	E	E	N	N

English Instruction	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr	Oct	Dec	Feb	Apr
Concepts	Janeth				Mapi				Martha			
1. Conceptual Interpretation	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
2. Meaning through print	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
3. Elaborates thoughts	E	E	E	E	E	N	N	E	E	E	E	E
4. Personal reflection	E	N	N	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
5. Uses descriptive words	N	N	N	E	E	E	E	E	E	N	E	E

E=Evident in sample

N=Not Evident

Across the three instructional contexts the concepts for examining the students' use of acquired English in journal writing was compared. In the area of writing using conceptual interpretations, evidence was found on every sample collected from all three contextual settings. This was also true for students being able to convey their message through the print more than through pictures. All nine students from the three

contextual settings used the printed word to convey their message more than they depended on pictorial representations. In the areas of conceptual interpretation and conveying meaning through print, no differences were found between students in either Spanish, dual language, or English instructed contexts.

However the concept of elaborating on thoughts was far less evident from those samples taken from the Spanish and dual language instructed students. Only twice in the dual language context and three times in the Spanish instructed samples showed any evidence of elaborating on thoughts, while students in the English instructed context showed evidence of this more than eighty percent of the time.

Writing using personal reflection was found less than fifty percent of the time by students in the Spanish and dual language instructed contexts while again evident on English instructed student samples more than eighty percent of the time. This also held true for the concept of using descriptive words in writing. Less than fifty percent of the time this was evident on student samples from both the Spanish and dual language contexts, while English instructed students used descriptive words at least seventy-five percent of the time.

In three of the five concept areas used to examine students use of acquired English in journal writings, students in the English instructed context scored better than students in either the Spanish or dual language settings.

Results

The first question posed in this project was would having dual language instruction increase the quality of second language writing in story summaries? Two gains were made in fluency, all three students made gains in grammar, and some gains were made in vocabulary. No gains were found in the area of sentence variety by the students in the dual language setting. Samples collected and evaluated for this purpose indicated that definite gains were found, yet these were marked by periods of plateaus and regressions over time. This result could be influenced by the growth and maturity of the students over the year, as well as their oral command of the second language increasing.

The second question was would any group across the three contexts show any difference in the use of proper writing mechanics? The scores of those students instructed in Spanish showed evidence of a regression in using periods properly, gains in the area of using capitals properly, and a decrease in their use of inventive spelling. Students in the dual language context showed gains in the use of periods, a plateau in their use of capitals, and also a decrease in the use of inventive spelling. In the English instructed context evidence of regressions in both students' use of periods and capitals was evident, yet these students also showed a decrease in the number of inventive spellings.

Finally, the third question raised was would any group demonstrate more frequent use of newly acquired English in their daily journal writing? Those students in the English instructed class did use more of their newly acquired second language in their journal writing. Of the five concept areas examined, three of the differences shown were in favor of the English instructed group. No differences were found in the other two concept areas. This finding is consistent with that of Campbell, Gray, et al (1985) which stated that the more exposure students have to their second language, the more they were able to use that language in their writing.

These findings parallel findings by other researchers in the field of writing and bilingual programs. Evidence of students moving back and forth between making gains, reaching plateaus, and encountering regressions was evident in student writing.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Both the cognitive development of the students and the interactive approaches used in the three classrooms played a significant role in this project. Vygotsky perceived language as significantly influencing cognition. His views have become quite popular over the past decade due to the emphasis placed on social interaction (Williams & Snipper, 1990). Determining whether students in a dual language instructional context would show gains in their second language writing was one of the questions raised. Because the children would be exposed to both their native Spanish and English in this setting, one could suppose that their developing cognition would result in improved use of their second language. Results from students enrolled in a dual language instructional context indicate that gains in fluency and grammar were found. Use of newly acquired vocabulary occurred to a small degree, but no evidence was found of variety in sentence structures.

Social interaction within the classroom settings should result with higher cognitive development due to the exchange of ideas and learning from others. This would indicate that students in all three contextual settings should show improvement in proper use of mechanics. The writing process received emphasis in all classes under study, editing and revising strategies therefore played a significant role in

assisting students to comprehend why periods are placed at the end of a sentence instead of at the end of every line of print. The teachers in these settings did not teach skills of punctuation or use of capitals in isolation. Students were able to learn from their early attempts and revisions why these mechanics of writing were important in conveying messages. Findings by Franklin (1988) showed that students borrowed stylistic features from authors and incorporated these into their own texts. Laing (1988) also studied writing of students in bilingual contexts and discussed the cross-lingual transfer as described by Cummins as having an effect on student writing. Edelsky and Jilbert (1985) provided insights into the errors children make in their writing. These researchers determined that the errors were not random, but resulted from the children making hypotheses about language. This would cause children to make generalizations of phonetic features and use of segmentation.

In the use of proper mechanics, students in the Spanish and dual language contexts showed evidence of gains in using periods and capitals correctly, while the English instructed group displayed a regression in these areas. Students in all three contextual settings did display a decrease in the number of inventive spellings over time, this in part was due to the instruction they received in conventional spelling and also due to the expanded use of student dictionaries during the year in all instructional settings.

Addressing the issue of which contextual settings may

result in using more acquired second language in journal writing, Campbell, Gray, Rhodes, and Snow (1985) determined that students from various language instructed contexts are influenced by the instruction they receive. Students who were given more exposure to their second language appeared to use more of their newly acquired vocabulary in their writing. This finding is consistent with that of this project.

Students enrolled in the English instructed class demonstrated a much higher percentage of improvement than those students in the other two contexts.

As with all studies, parent, teacher and student expectations and attitudes also play a significant role in the final results. Because these students had been placed in these different settings prior to the beginning of the project, the values and expectations of students, teachers, and parents cannot be ignored.

Conclusions

Story summaries written by students in a bilingual setting indicated that these children were able to improve the quality of their writing over time. Franklin (1988) also found that students respond in a variety of ways, some to the action, others to the conclusion, and still others to the relationships within the story. Bartolome, Bastian, and Kuhlman (1991) determined that writing means different things to different children. This provides an answer as to why Jose

shows greater gains in his use of fluency and grammar while Adrian improved more in the areas of grammar and vocabulary.

Reviewing use of mechanics across the three contexts resulted with higher gains in the Spanish and dual language instructed groups. However, gains were displayed by all students across the instructional contexts. This indicates that children with different language backgrounds will develop mechanical skills in much the same manner and sequence while displaying periods of rapid progress, regressions, and plateaus.

Students in the Spanish instructed group used less English vocabulary in their journal writings, only writing in English occasionally. This may have been influenced by the fact that for two years previous to the year this project was undertaken, these students had been instructed in English, thereby making writing in their primary language a new experience. Students instructed in English were exposed to their second language throughout the day, thus enabling them to use more vocabulary than the other two groups.

The nine students in this project were all still very young and in the beginning stages of learning how to convey messages through print. Individual growth and maturity must also be taken into account in the results found. It appears that regardless of the language of instruction, all students demonstrated individual improvement over the year in their written work and were learning how to manipulate the written word.

Educational Implications

This project, and those conducted by other researchers, indicate that learning to write is a complicated matter for young students. Students acquiring a second language have even more complicated issues to resolve in their written work. Assessments need to be based on individual progress and not by the traditional methods of grading. Writing portfolios were kept on the nine students throughout the year. The three teachers involved met occasionally to review student samples and make comparisons between individual samples. Mechanical skills seem to develop in a similar manner for all students. Skills acquired in the use of proper mechanics are a part of growth and maturity and did not need to be taught as separate and distinct skills.

Students were able to write more when they selected their own topics and could draw from their own experiences. Assigned writing tasks that required background knowledge or certain vocabulary may present a problem for students who lack these. Students are exposed to the written word prior to ever beginning school. Therefore, teachers should set aside some time every day for children to write. Initial stages of writing may only include picture representations or scribbles, yet teachers must provide encouragement and support to assist in the child's development.

Progress measured on an individual basis and over a

period of time will provide a clearer picture of the student's range of abilities and indicate where each child's skills are at any given time. This information can be passed from teacher to teacher as the child progresses through the grades. Individual strengths and weaknesses need to be assessed to assist students in their own writing progress.

APPENDIX 1

EVALUATION FORM

NAME _____

	Date _____			Date _____			Date _____		
	C	D	NE	C	D	NE	C	D	NE
WRITING QUALITY:									
Self-selected topics									
Uses expansive vocabulary									
Uses complex sentences									
Experiments with different styles									
Revision strategies									
WRITING MECHANICS:									
Handwriting									
Uses periods									
Uses quotation marks									
Uses exclamation point									
Uses question marks									
Uses capitalization									
Grammar Usage									
Ratio and % invented spelling									
Ratio and % conventional spelling									

C = Controls this D = Developing this NE = No evidence of this

Primary Language: _____

Secondary Language: _____

Comments: _____

APPENDIX 2

WRITING MATRIX

TRAIT	BEGINNING LEVEL	INTERMEDIATE LEVEL	ADVANCED LEVEL
FLUENCY	Writes one or two short sentences.	Writes several sentences.	Writes a paragraph or more.
ORGANIZATION	Lacks logical sequence or so short that organization presents a problem.	Somewhat sequenced.	Follows standard organization for genre.
GRAMMAR	Basic word-order problems. Uses only present tense forms.	Minor grammatical errors, such as "s" on verbs in 3rd person singular.	Grammar resembles native speaker's of same age.
VOCABULARY	Limited vocabulary. Needs to rely at times on first language or ask for translation.	Knows most words needed to express ideas but lacks vocabulary for finer shades of meaning	Flexible in word choice; similar to good native writer's of same age.
SENTENCE VARIETY	Uses one or two sentence patterns.	Uses several sentence patterns.	Uses a good variety of sentence patterns effectively.

APPENDIX 3

EVALUATION FORM DESIGNED FOR THIS PROJECT

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
WRITING QUALITY:									
Fluency									
Organization									
Grammar									
Vocabulary									
Genre									
Sentence Variety									
WRITING MECHANICS:									
Handwriting									
Uses Periods									
Uses Question Marks									
Uses Capitalization									

A = Advanced

I = Intermediate

B = Beginning

N = Not present

APPENDIX 4

JOURNAL ASSESSMENT FORM

TITLE VII PORTFOLIO

INTERACTIAVE WRITING JOURNAL ASSESSMENT

	OCT.	DEC.	FEB.	APR.
1. L1 and/or L2*				
2. Conceptual Interpretations				
3. Meaning is mostly conveyed through print rather than picture				
4. Elaborates on thoughts				
5. Personal reflections				
6. Uses descriptive words				

* Indicate in the boxes provided if the student is using L1 and/or L2.

✓ = If evident

N = Not evident

References

- Abramson, S., Seda, I., & Johnson, C. (1990) Literacy development in a multicultural kindergarten classroom. Journal of the Association for Childhood Education. Winter. 68-72.
- Ammon, P. & M. (1987) Hidden Resources in the Reading and Writing of Bilingual Children. Yearbook- Claremont Reading Conference. 52-68.
- Alvarez, S. (1983) Analysis of English/Spanish oral interaction between first grade Mexican-American children and teacher-aides. Department of Education. Texas A & I University. Kingsville, Tx. 1-26.
- Ballard & Tighe (1980&1989) IDEA Language Proficiency Test
- Bartolome, L., Bastian, M., & Kuhlman, N. (1991) Interactive journal writing in a two-way bilingual first grade classroom. Yearbook-Claremont Reading Conference. 185-200.
- Brown, J. & Bailey, K. (1984) A categorical instrument for scoring second language writing skills. Language Learning. 34(4). 21-42.
- Campbell, R., Gray, T., Rhodes, N., & Snow, M. (1985) Foreign language learning in the elementary schools: A comparison of three language programs. Modern Language Journal. 6(1). 44-54.
- Cronnell, B. (1985) Languages influences in the English writing of third and sixth grade Mexican-American students. Journal of Educational Research. 78(3). 168-173.
- Cummins, J. (1989) Empowering Minority Students. California Association for Bilingual Education. Sacramento, Ca.
- Diaz, D. (1986) The writing process and the ESL writer: Reinforcement from second language research. The Writing Instructor. 5. 167-175.
- Dolly, M. (1990) Integrating ESL reading and writing through authentic discourse. Journal of Reading. 33. 360-365.

- Edelsky, C. & Jilbert, K. (1985) Bilingual children and writing: Lessons for all of us. Volta Review. 87(5). 57-72.
- Edelsky, C. (1986) Writing in a Bilingual Program- Habia Una Vez Ablex Publishing Corp. Norwood, N.J.
- Franklin, E. (1988) Reading and writing stories: Children creating meaning. The Reading Teacher. 42. 184-190.
- Goldman, S. & Rueda, R. (1988) Developing writing skills in bilingual exceptional children. Exceptional Children. 54. 543-551.
- Goodman, K., Goodman, Y., & Hood, W. (1989) The Whole Language Evaluation Book. Irwin Publishers, Toronto.
- Hadaway, N. (1992) Letters to Literacy- Spurring second language development across the curriculum. Childhood Education. 24-48.
- Hudelson, S. (1984) Kan yu ret an rayt en Ingles: Children become literate in English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly. 18(2). 221-238.
- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T (1982) The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Laing, D. (1988) A comparative study of the writing abilities of English-speaking grade 8 students in French-speaking schools. Canadian Journal of Education. 13(2). 306-324.
- Levine, J. (1988) Literature Your Way. Frank Schaffer Publications. Palos Verdes, Ca.
- Lionni, L. (1968) Swimmy. Pantheon Books- Random House. N.Y.
- Medina, M. (1991) Native and Spanish language proficiency in a bilingual education program. The Journal of Educational Research. 85(2). 100-106.

- Peregoy, S. & Boyle, O. (1989-90) Kindergarteners Write! Emergent literacy of Mexican American children in a two-way Spanish immersion program. The Journal of the Association of Mexican American Educators. 6-18.
- Perez, B., & Torres-Guzman, M. (1992) Learning in Two Worlds- An Integrated Spanish/English Biliteracy Approach. Longman Publishing. N.Y.
- Peyton, J., Staton, J., Richardson, G. & Wolfram, W. (1990) The influence of writing task on ESL student's written production. Research on the Teaching of English. 24(2) 142-171.
- Williams, H. & L. (1969) The Little Red Hen/ La Pequena Gallina Roja. Prentice Hall. N.J.
- Williams, J. & Snipper, G. (1990) Literacy and Bilingualism. Longman Publishing. N.Y.
- Winter, J. (1991) Diego. Alfred A. Knopf. N.Y.
- Vygotsky, L. (1989) Thought and Language. Fourth edition. Cambridge, Ma: MIT press.